



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/711,549

09/24/2004

Gopesh Kumer

001-450

5548

37476 7590 03/04/2009
WHITE-WELKER & WELKER, LLC
P.O. BOX 199
CLEAR SPRING, MD 21722-0199

EXAMINER

MEJIA, ANTHONY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2451

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/04/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/711,549	Applicant(s) KUMER, GOPESH	
	Examiner ANTHONY MEJIA	Art Unit 2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 September 2004 and 19 May 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Acknowledgement is made that that no additional amendments have been made to the previously presented claims that were filed on 19 May 2008, which are now currently pending and being presented. It has been noted that the status identifier for Claim 1 contains a spelling error. Applicants are requested to verify the correctness of all status identifiers in their next response.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities: the limitation "having a User initiate contact with **a Service Provider**" in line 6 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 2-14 are also objected to as to at least inheriting the same deficiency through their dependency to Claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to particular machine, or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. See page 10 of In Re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385.

Art Unit: 2451

4. The instant claims are neither positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transform underlying subject matter, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. In the instant application, in Claim 1, a method of connecting two parties in real time, the method comprising the steps of:

“having...”, “enabling...” and “connecting...” are broad enough that the claim could be completely performed mentally, verbally or without a machine nor is any transformation apparent.

In further, in the instant application, in Claim 15, a method of connecting two parties in real time, the method comprising the steps of:

“having an Agent account”, “assigning...”, “having a Service Provider enter said Agent ID when registering as a new Advisor”, “linking...”, “distributing...”, “enabling...” and “connecting...” are broad enough that the claim could be completely performed mentally, verbally or without a machine nor is any transformation apparent.

Claims 2-14 and Claims 16-20 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as to at least inheriting the same deficiencies through their dependency to Claim 1 and 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2451

6. Claims 1, 6, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber et al. (US 7,308,422) (referred herein after as Faber 1) and in further view of Lurie (US 2003/0115089) (referred herein after as Lurie 1).

Regarding Claim 1, Faber 1 teaches a method of connecting two parties in real time, the method comprising:

having one or more Agents (wherein herein and after, an agent is being interpreted as one who integrates and employs the system within their websites or other Internet-based displayed and/or published materials offering a unique, differentiated grouping of Service Providers who collectively employ the system, see para [0014] of Applicant's disclosure) (e.g., a logic unit within controller computer 300 presents specialized webpage(s) to customers) having an associated selected plurality of Service Providers (col.3, lines 61-64, col.4, lines 31-67, col.5, lines 1-22, and col.8, lines 27-57);

enabling said Agents to integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their own specialized websites for browsing by a User (col.4, lines 31-67, col.5, lines 1-22, and col.8, lines 27-57);

having a User initiate contact with a Service Provider via an Agent's specialized website (col.8, lines 63-67 and col.9, lines 1-8). Faber 1 does not explicitly teach the final step of:

connecting said User with said Service Provider if available.

However, Lurie 1 in a similar field of endeavor discloses an apparatus and method for online advice customer relationship management including the step of:

Art Unit: 2451

connecting a User with a Service Provider if available (par [0088]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lurie 1 in the teachings of Faber to connect a User to their desired Service Provider in real-time when available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber and Lurie 1 to generate more capital for service providers, and to also provide additional compensation for the systems providing live advice to the customers desiring services from service providers (Lurie: pars [0006-0007]).

Regarding Claim 6, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

displaying said Service Provider's hours of availability within a pop-up window (Lurie 1: pars [0081-0082]).

Regarding Claim 9, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

having a system manage the transaction records for said Agent's Service Providers (Lurie 1: par [0043]).

Art Unit: 2451

Regarding Claim 10, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 9 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

including reporting said transaction records (Lurie 1: par [0043] and [0065]).

Regarding Claim 11, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 9 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

calculating the amount due to the Service Provider based on the Service Provider's transactions (Faber 1: col.10, lines 49-53).

Regarding Claim 12, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 11 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

paying the Service Provider and the Agent the amount due based on the transactions (Faber 1: col.10, lines 49-53).

Regarding Claim 13, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

assigning an Agent ID number (e.g., user name) to an Agent account (e.g., account(s) on database 310), (Faber 1: col.4, lines 10-21).

7. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Faber et al. (US 6,865,540) (referred herein after as Faber 2).

Regarding Claim 2, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 do not teach wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

- generating a pop-up window with information about said Service Provider ;
- checking to see if the Service Provider is available.

However, Faber 2 in a similar field of endeavor discloses a method and apparatus for providing group calls via the Internet including the steps of:

- generating a pop-up window with information about said Service Provider (col.5, lines 20-50 and see fig.3);
- checking to see if the Service Provider is available (col.5, lines 20-50, and see fig.3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Faber 2 in the teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 to enable the user of the system to be able to get information of a service provider and seeing if said service provider's availability. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the

Art Unit: 2451

teachings of Faber 1/Lurie/Faber 2 to help match users of the system with the appropriate service providers (Faber 2: col.1, lines 25-31).

Regarding Claim 3, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Faber 2 teach the method as described in claim 2 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Faber 2 further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

having said pop-up window prompting said User to enter their phone number to make said connection (Faber 2: col.4, lines 50-64, see fig.4).

Regarding Claim 4, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/ Faber 2 teach the method as described in claim 2 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Faber 2 further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

generating a message for said User in said pop-up window when said Service Provider is not available (Lurie 1: par [0082]).

Regarding Claim 5, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/ Faber 2 teach the method as described in claim 2 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Faber 2 further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

allowing said Service Provider to enter their hours of availability (Faber 1: col.8, lines 6-18).

Art Unit: 2451

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Lurie et al. (US 7,289,623) (referred herein after as Lurie 2).

Regarding Claim 7, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Lurie 1 and Faber 1 do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

denying said connection if a User tries to initiate a connection during the hours said Service Provider is scheduled to be not available.

However, Lurie 2 in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for an online speaker patch-through, including the step of:

denying said connection if a User tries to initiate a connection during the hours said Service Provider is scheduled to be not available (col.5, lines 43-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lurie 2 in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1 in order to prevent the service seeker from trying to connect to the service provider when the service provider is not available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/ Lurie 2 to help the service seekers of the system know what service providers are readily available in real-time (Lurie 2: col.1, lines 65-67, and col.2, lines 1-2).

Art Unit: 2451

9. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Faber et al. (US 2004/0252820) (referred herein after as Faber 3).

Regarding Claim 8, Faber 1/Lurie 1 teaches the method as described in Claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1 do not explicitly disclose wherein the method further comprises the step of:

displaying in said a pop-up window that said Service Provider is currently busy on another call if said Service Provider is currently on another system call.

However, Faber 3 in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for arranging a call including the step of:

displaying in said a pop-up window that said Service Provider is currently busy on another call if said Service Provider is currently on another system call (par [0053])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Faber in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1 in order to properly notify the service seeker of the system that the Service Provider's is temporarily not available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Faber 3 to provide a more user friendly interaction between the users of the system and service providers (Faber 3: par [0003]).

Art Unit: 2451

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Rigole (US 7,139,728).

Regarding Claim 14, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly registered Service Provider.

However, Rigole in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for online selection of service providers of server accounts including the step of:

distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly registered Service Provider (col.17, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Rigole in the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 to enable the Service Providers to properly distribute the HTML code to the Agent to present to the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1 and Rigole to allow the service providers to dynamically present there services on a website to fit the unique nature of each of the individual users of the system (Rigole: col.1, lines 53-67, and col.2, lines 1-10)

Art Unit: 2451

11. Claims 15-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Rigole (US 7,139,728) and in further view of Lurie 1.

Regarding Claim 15, Faber 1 teaches a method of connecting two parties in real time, the method comprising:

having an Agent account (Faber 1: e.g., account set up on the database, col.4, lines 10-51);

assigning an Agent ID (e.g., certain information such as a username) number to said Agent account (Faber 1: col.4, lines 10-51);

having a Service Provider enter said Agent ID when registering as a new Advisor (Faber 1: e.g., during registration, a Service Provider is requested to submit certain information, col.4, lines 10-51);

linking all Service Providers under a single Agent ID into one account information and transaction activity management interface (Faber 1: col.4, lines 10-51);

enabling the Agent to readily create own Internet-based collection of specialized Service Providers (Faber 1: col.4, lines 31-67, col.5, lines 1-22, and col.8, lines 27-57).

Faber 1 does not explicitly teach the step of:

distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly registered Service Provider thereby.

However, Rigole in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for online selection of service providers of server accounts including the step of:

distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly registered Service Provider thereby (e.g., files that a Service Provider desires to make available to its consumers, may be uploaded in HTML to the Interchange Party Communication System having means of presenting user interfaces to consumer computer systems displaying services being offered by Service Providers, col.16, lines 61-67 and col.17, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Rigole in the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 to enable the Service Providers to properly distribute the HTML code to the Agent to present to the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1 and Rigole to allow the service providers to dynamically present there services on a website to fit the unique nature of each of the individual users of the system (Rigole: col.1, lines 53-67, and col.2, lines 1-10). The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Rigole do not explicitly teach the step of:

connecting Users with these Service Providers for expert advice in real time via a telephone connection.

However, Lurie 1 in a similar field of endeavor discloses an apparatus and method for online advice customer relationship management including the step of:

connecting Users with these Service Providers for expert advice in real time via a telephone connection (par [0088]).

Art Unit: 2451

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lurie 1 in the teachings of Faber to connect a User to their desired Service Provider in real-time when available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Rigole to generate more capital for service providers, and to also provide additional compensation for the systems providing live advice to the customers desiring services from service providers (Lurie 1: pars [0006-0007]).

Regarding Claim 16, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Rigole teach the method as described in Claim 15 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Rigole further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

displaying within a pop-up window a full list of an Agent's Service Provider's and their individual availability statuses (Faber 1: col.8, lines 22-36 and see fig.6).

Regarding Claim 17, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Rigole teach the method as described in Claim 15 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Rigole further teach wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

monitoring how long telephonic connections are maintained between said Users and said Service Providers (Faber 1: col.10, lines 43-53); and

deducting from Users' consumer accounts the amounts based upon how long the telephonic connections are maintained (Faber 1: col.10, lines 43-53).

Regarding Claim 19, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 teach the method as described in Claim 15 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

giving an Agent the option of self-managed payroll responsibility or, a managed payout consisting of (col.5, lines 1-5, col.10, lines 43-53 and see fig.4):

deducting a pre-determined Agent service fee for each transaction and distributing the Agent to fee said Agents (col.10, lines 51-53).

12. Claim 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Rigole in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Lund (US 7,403,947).

Regarding Claim 18, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 teach the method as described in Claim 15 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

allowing for said Users to remain in effect on the website of the Agent while navigating and using the system for connecting telephonically to Service Providers, by way of a series of progressive popup windows.

However, Lund in a similar field of endeavor discloses a method and apparatus for providing computer-network related information about a calling party including the steps of:

allowing for said Users to remain in effect on the website of the Agent while navigating and using the system for connecting telephonically to Service Providers, by way of a series of progressive popup windows (it is a well-known feature, that websites may contain a series of progressive popup windows) (e.g., after a call is answered by a service provider, a customer may interact with the business website of the service provider, for continuing advertising and shopping during the course of a conversation between the customer and service provider, col.6, lines 53-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lund in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 to allow users to continually interact with the agent while be connected to the Service Providers. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine all of the teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Luire 1/Lund to generate more capital for service providers, and to also provide additional compensation for the systems providing live advice to the customers desiring services from service providers (Lurie 1: pars [0006-0007]).

13. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Rigole in further view of Lurie 1 in further view of Boubez et al. (US 2002/0087340) (referred herein after as Boubez) and in further view of Faber 2.

Regarding Claim 20, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 teach the method as described in Claim 15 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

having recognition, across the entire database (database 310) of Service Provider's telephone numbers including potentially multiple different accounts, of whether a particular Service Provider's telephone line is busy thereby (Lurie 1: e.g., real-time availability statuses, par [0082]). The combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

enabling a Service Provider to register and be part of numerous different Agent groups.

However, Boubez in a similar field of endeavor discloses an apparatus and method for categorizing services including the step of:

enabling a Service Provider to register and be part of numerous different Agent groups (e.g., categories) (e.g., the service provider decides, at registration time, in which category or categories the service is to be registered, pars [0038], [0066-0068], and [0073]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Boubez in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 to enable the service providers to be part of various categories made available to the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 2451

the invention was made would have been motivated to combine all of the teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1/Boubez to minimize the difficulty for the users of the system in locating the service provider they desire (par [0006]).

In further, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1/Boubez do not explicitly teach the step of:

enabling a Service Provider to register and be part of numerous different Agent groups, *without concern for any potential telephone connection conflict*.

However, Faber 2 in a similar field of endeavor discloses a method and apparatus for providing group calls via the Internet including the step of:

not having a concern for any potential telephone connection conflict (e.g., Service-providers are capable of having two-way connections with different users of the system, that are controlled by a moderator, thus avoiding conflicts, col.3, lines 35-45, col.6, lines 1-26, and col.8, lines 38-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1/Boubez with the teachings of Faber 2 to avoid conflicts in a telephone connection with the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine all of the teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1/Boubez/Faber 2 to allow the Service Providers to provide services simultaneously to multiple users of the system.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments, see pages 6-11, filed 04 December 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-3, 4-6, and 9-14 under 102 (e) and Claims 7-8, and 15-20 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the newly discovered references cited above.

Conclusion

Examiner has cited particular paragraphs, columns, and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY MEJIA whose telephone number is (571)270-3630. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 9:30AM-8:00PM EST.

Art Unit: 2451

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mejia, Anthony/
Patent Examiner

/Salad Abdullahi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457